

**FSL Manuscript Review and Release Form**  
(Return completed review form to your secretary)

Name of Author(s):

Name of Manuscript:

Name of Publisher:

Editorial Review by Nita Fullerton (Yes \_ No \_)

Name of Peer Reviewer:

Release/Review: Division Chief's Signature/Date \_\_\_\_\_

---

**Peer Review Form**

- o Scientific value of content, either as an original contribution to the field or as a paper that belongs in the following classification (check one): **Major Significance** \_ **Minor Significance** \_ **Wide Interest** \_ **Interest** \_.
- o Mode and clarity of presentation: logical organization, language clarity, freedom from specialized slang/jargon, inclusion of all needed material, omission of nonessential material, and sufficient emphasis on main ideas. Check applicable blocks. **Outstanding** \_ **Very Good** \_ **Satisfactory** \_ **Minor Defects** \_ **Major Defects** \_\_. Comments:

**Specifics:**

- Subject matter/publisher appropriate for publication as a contribution from NOAA. **Yes** \_ **No** \_.
- Abstract succinctly describes most important facts about this study. **Yes** \_ **No** \_.
- References appear to be accurate. **Yes** \_ **No** \_.
- Figures/captions and tables/captions appear to be complete. **Yes** \_ **No** \_.
- Length of paper is appropriate? **Yes** \_ **No** \_ . List **Key Words**: \_\_\_\_\_

**Changes:**

- Do you suggest any changes in the manuscript? **Yes** \_ **No** \_.
- Did you discuss the changes with the author? **Yes** \_ **No** \_.
- Did the author agree with your suggestions and make the changes? **Yes** \_ **No** \_.
- Are the changes incorporated in the attached manuscript? **Yes** \_ **No** \_.
- Do you want to review the paper again if changes are necessary? **Yes** \_ **No** \_.

**Technical Soundness and Reliability**

- The paper appears to be technically sound and free from mathematical/other errors. **Yes** \_ **No** \_.
- Are the premise and method of approach sound? Are the measurements adequate in scope and number to support the conclusions? Were the measuring instruments properly calibrated? Are conclusions set forth clearly and accurately and are they supported by convincing evidence? Are the results reproducible as to both method and data? Are additional data or tests needed?

**Comments and Suggestions:**

**Overall Evaluation** (provide a short summary as to why you think this paper is or is not ready for publication).

**Recommendation** (check one):

- Publish this manuscript in present form, or with minor revisions in the medium proposed. **Yes** \_ **No** \_ . In another medium (name) \_\_\_\_\_.
- Publish only after major revisions and additional review. **Yes** \_ **No** \_.
- Rejection. **Yes** \_ **No** \_.